UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/082,300	02/26/2002	Naoki Tsuchitoi	03500.016242.	2783

5514   7590   02/19/2009
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER
HUNTSINGER, PETER K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/19/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *09 December 2008*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22 and 25-27* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22 and 25-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *11/08*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-5, 1-22 and 25-27 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   Claims 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention. In claim 25, lines 9-10 include the limitation "a

searching unit adapted search the print data, a specific period of time has passed since

the print data was stored in said storage." It is unclear whether "a specific period of time

has passed" refers to the searching of print data or not. Claim 27 requires a similar

correction.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1, 5, 11, 15, 18, 20-22 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Taniguchi '972 in view of Howell '699.

Referring to **claim 1**, Taniguchi '972 discloses a printer controller for controlling

printing of print data comprising:

storage adapted to store print data (col. 7, lines 34-39, printer receives print

content data) and authentication information corresponding to the print data (col. 7, lines

21-28, user enters password into printer);

an authentication unit adapted to authenticate a user based on authentication

information manually input by a user (col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical

printer receives print job); and

a control unit adapted to enable said printer to print, based on user instruction,

the stored print data corresponding to the authentication information if the user is

authenticated by said authentication unit (col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical

printer executes printing)

Taniguchi '972 discloses deleting a print job from a printer, but does not disclose

expressly deleting a job from the printer at a user specified time.

Howell '699 discloses a deletion unit adapted to delete the print data from said

storage at a predetermined time, manually set by a user (col. 3, lines 19-24, retention

time stamp specified by the security subject), if a specific period of time has passed

since the print data was stored in said storage, the predetermined time being not set

based on the specific period of time (col. 3, lines 49-65, each object is periodically

polled [checked after a specific period of time has passed] and the retention time is compared to the current system time).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete a job from the printer after a user specified time. The motivation for doing so would have been to delete data that is no longer needed to obtain free storage space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Howell '699 with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Referring to **claim 5**, Howell '699 discloses a determination unit that determines at the predetermined time, for all of the print data stored in the storage, whether the specific period of time has passed since the print data was stored in said storage (col. 3, lines 49-65, each object is periodically polled [checked after a specific period of time has passed] and the retention time is compared to the current system time),

wherein said deletion unit deletes stored print data from the storage if the specific period of time has passed for that stored print data and does not delete the stored print data if the specific period of time has not passed for that stored print data (col. 3, lines 49-65, object is periodically polled and determined whether the current time is greater than or equals the time specified by the retention time stamp).

Referring to **claim 11**, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Referring to **claim 15**, see the rejection of claim 5 above.

Referring to **claim 16**, Taniguchi '972 discloses a data processing method for providing a print service using an information processing apparatus for storing the print

data and authentication information corresponding to the print data, and a printer,

comprising:

a transmission of authentication information manually input by a user to print the

print data from the printer to the information processing apparatus (S610 of Fig. 6, col.

7, lines 24-27);

authenticating a user based on the transmitted authentication information at the

information processing apparatus col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical printer

receives print job);

enabling the print to print, based on user instruction, the transmitted print data if

the user is authenticated (col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical printer executes

printing)

Taniguchi '972 discloses deleting a print job from a printer, but does not disclose

expressly deleting a job from the printer at a user specified time.

Howell '699 discloses deleting the print data from said storage at a

predetermined time, manually set by a user (col. 3, lines 19-24, retention time stamp

specified by the security subject), if a specific period of time has passed since the print

data was stored in said storage, the predetermined time being not set based on the

specific period of time (col. 3, lines 49-65, each object is periodically polled [checked

after a specific period of time has passed] and the retention time is compared to the

current system time).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to delete a job from the printer after a user specified time. The motivation

for doing so would have been to delete data that is no longer needed to obtain free

storage space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Howell '699 with

Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 16.

Referring to **claim 18**, Taniguchi '972 discloses wherein the print data is

transmitted from the information processing apparatus to the printer with information

indicating a name given to the print data corresponding to the input authentication

information (Fig. 10b, col. 10, lines 46-58, printer receives and displays job generator

IDs).

Referring to **claim 20**, Taniguchi '972 discloses deletion of print data from the

printer after the end of printing the print data (S615 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 49-52).

Referring to **claim 21**, see the rejection of claim 1 above.

Referring to **claim 22**, see the rejection of claim 16 above.

Referring to **claim 25**, Taniguchi '972 discloses a printer controller for controlling

printing of print data comprising:

storage adapted to store print data (col. 7, lines 34-39, printer receives print

content data) and authentication information corresponding to the print data (col. 7, lines

21-28, user enters password into printer);

an authentication unit adapted to authenticate a user based on authentication

information manually input by a user (col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical

printer receives print job); and

a control unit adapted to enable said printer to print, based on user instruction,

the stored print data corresponding to the authentication information if the user is

authenticated by said authentication unit (col. 7, lines 35-39, if passwords are identical printer executes printing)

Taniguchi '972 discloses deleting a print job from a printer, but does not disclose expressly searching print data after a specific period of time has passed or deleting a job from the printer at a user specified time.

Howell '699 discloses a searching unit adapted search the print data, a specific period of time has passed since the print data was stored in said storage (col. 3, lines 49-65, each object is periodically polled [checked after a specific period of time has passed] and the retention time is compared to the current system time); and

a deletion unit adapted to perform a delete process for deleting the print data searched by said searching unit, the deletion process being performed at a predetermined time manually set by a user (col. 3, lines 19-24, retention time stamp specified by the security subject), the predetermined time being not set based on the specific period of time (col. 3, lines 49-65, each object is periodically polled [checked after a specific period of time has passed] and the retention time is compared to the current system time).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to delete a job from the printer after a user specified time. The motivation for doing so would have been to delete data that is no longer needed to obtain free storage space. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Howell '699 with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 25.

Referring to **claim 26**, Howell '699 discloses wherein searching of the print data

by said searching unit is performed at the predetermined time manually set by the user

(col. 3, lines 19-24, retention time stamp specified by the security subject) (col. 3, lines

49-65, the retention time is compared to the current system time as each object is

periodically polled).

Referring to **claim 27**, see the rejection of claim 25 above.

6.   Claims 2, 3, 12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Taniguchi '972 and Howell '699 as applied to claims 1 and 11 above,

and further in view of Mori '765.

Referring to **claims 2**, Taniguchi '972 discloses print data stored in said storage

unit, but does not disclose expressly assigning the print data a priority level.

Mori '765 discloses wherein each print data stored in a storage is given a priority

level, a printer controller further comprising a deletion unit adapted to delete one of the

stored print data which is given a low priority level upon detecting that said storage

cannot store the print data anymore (col. 4-5, lines 66-67, 1-10).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to assign a priority level to stored data. The motivation for doing so would

have been to delete data that is less important when a storage unit is full. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to combine Mori '765 with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the

invention as specified in claim 2.

Referring to **claim 3**, Mori '765 discloses wherein the print data which is given

the low priority level means the print data which was received earlier than any other

print data received by said printer controller (col. 4-5, lines 66-67, 1-10).

Referring to **claim 12**, see the rejection of claim 2 above.

Referring to **claim 13**, see the rejection of claim 3 above.

7.   Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Taniguchi '972, Howell '699 and Mori '765 as applied to claims 2 and 12 and above, and

further in view of Reifman '433.

Referring to **claim 4**, Howell '699 discloses a deletion unit adapted to delete print

data, but does not disclose expressly notifying a destination address when print data is

deleted.

Reifman '433 discloses notification means for notifying a destination address set

up when an error occurs (col. 73, lines 64-67).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary in the

art to notifying a destination address when the print data is breached. The motivation

for doing so would have been to alert the user when print data is no longer stored and

available for printing. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Reifman '433

with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 4.

Referring to **claim 14**, see the rejection of claim 4 above.

8. Claims 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taniguchi '972 and Howell '699 as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Arledge '294.

Referring to **claim 17**, Taniguchi '972 discloses a request of the stored print data but does not disclose expressly confirming a print charge for printing.

Arledge '294 discloses a request of the stored print data of the information processing apparatus after confirming that the print charge for printing the print data selected by the user is paid (col. 21, lines 15-32, order is suspended until payment is received).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to charge for printing. The motivation for doing so would have been to collect a fee for a provided service. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Arledge '294 with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 17.

Referring to **claim 19**, Taniguchi '972 discloses transmission of a list of print data corresponding to the authentication information before transmitting the print data from the information processing apparatus (S606 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 1-10);

displaying, at the printer, the transmitted list of print data on a display of the printer (S607 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 11-15);

enabling the user to select print data from the displayed list of print data (S608 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 16-19);

transmitting the information identifying the selected print data from the printer to the information processing apparatus (S610 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 24-28); and

transmitting the selected print data from the information processing apparatus to the printer based on the transmitted information identifying the selected print data (S612 of Fig. 6, col. 7, lines 34-39).

Taniguchi '972 does not disclose expressly displaying a list of print data after the user inputs the authentication information.

Arledge '294 discloses transmission of a list of print data corresponding to the authentication information before transmitting the print data from the information processing apparatus to the printer if the user is authenticated (Fig. 19, col. 19, lines 1-13).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to display a list of print jobs after a password has been entered. The motivation for doing so would have been to protect information of the user by only providing the print job list after a password has been entered. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Arledge '294 with Taniguchi '972 to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Conclusion

9.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Peter K. Huntsinger whose telephone number is

(571)272-7435. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571)-272-7437. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter K. Huntsinger/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625